

-- REMARKS --

The present amendment replies to an Office Action dated December 17, 2007. Claims 1-10 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 6, and 10 have been amended herein. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 on various grounds. The Applicants respond to each ground of rejection as subsequently recited herein and requests reconsideration of the present application.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Thus, to warrant the §102 rejection, the references cited by the Examiner must show each and every limitation of the claims in complete detail. The Applicants respectfully assert that the cited references fail to do so.

A. Claims 1, 6, and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,456,051 to Darzy (the *Darzy* patent).

The Applicants respectfully assert that the *Darzy* patent fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a DC/DC converter for use in a decentralized power generation system as recited in amended independent claim 1, a decentralized power generation system as recited in amended independent claim 6, or a method of operating a DC/DC converter in a decentralized power generation system as recited in amended independent claim 10, wherein the direct current supplied by a power generating unit is set so the power generating unit operates in the Maximum Power Point. At most, the *Darzy* patent discloses that an input voltage V_{in} is connected to the source of a PMOS transistor 2 and that the input voltage is derived from either a rectified alternating current supply or can be supplied directly from a direct current supply. *See* Figures 1, 2, and 4; column 1,

lines 9-12. Thus, the *Darzy* patent fails to disclose setting direct current so the power generating unit operates in the Maximum Power Point as recited in the amended independent claims.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 6, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the *Darzy* patent is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Obviousness is a question of law, based on the factual inquiries of 1) determining the scope and content of the prior art; 2) ascertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art; and 3) resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). See MPEP 2143.03. The Applicants respectfully assert that the cited references fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

B. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the *Darzy* patent in view of European Patent Application Publication No. EP 1241778 to Balakrishnan (the *Balakrishnan* publication).

The Applicants respectfully assert that the *Darzy* patent and the *Balakrishnan* publication, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of the Applicants' invention as claimed, as required to maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). As discussed in Section A above, the Applicants assert that the *Darzy* patent fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a DC/DC converter for use in a decentralized power generation system wherein the direct current supplied by a power generating unit is set so the power generating unit operates in the Maximum Power Point, as recited in amended independent claim 1. The *Balakrishnan* publication also fails to suggest these elements.

Claim 3 depends directly from independent claim 1 and so includes all the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that dependent claim 3 is allowable over the *Darzy* patent and the *Balakrishnan* publication for at least the same reasons as set forth above for independent claim 1.

In addition, the *Balakrishnan* publication fails to disclose or suggest the converting component is adapted to output a converted direct current repeatedly only for a short duration at a time in said short-circuit protection mode, as recited in dependent claim 3. At most, the *Balakrishnan* publication discloses the duration of the disable period of the initial auto-restart cycle or cycles is shortened significantly. *See* Abstract; paragraph [0014].

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the *Darzy* patent in view of the *Balakrishnan* publication is respectfully requested.

C. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the *Darzy* patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,671,193 to Pelkonen (the *Pelkonen* patent).

The Applicants respectfully assert that the *Darzy* patent and the *Pelkonen* patent, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of the Applicants' invention as claimed, as required to maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). As discussed in Section A above, the Applicants assert that the *Darzy* patent fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a DC/DC converter for use in a decentralized power generation system wherein the direct current supplied by a power generating unit is set so the power generating unit operates in the Maximum Power Point, as recited in amended independent claim 1. The *Pelkonen* patent also fails to suggest these elements.

Claim 4 depends directly from independent claim 1 and so includes all the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that dependent claim 4 is allowable over the *Darzy* patent and the *Pelkonen* patent for at least the same reasons as set forth above for independent claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the *Darzy* patent in view of the *Pelkonen* patent is respectfully requested.

D. Claims 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the *Darzy* patent in view of UK Patent Application Publication No. GB 2238672 to Simons, *et al.* (the *Simons* publication).

The Applicants respectfully assert that the *Darzy* patent and the *Simons* publication, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of the Applicants' invention as claimed, as required to maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). As discussed in Section A above, the Applicants assert that the *Darzy* patent fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a DC/DC converter for use in a decentralized power generation system as recited in amended independent claim 1 or a decentralized power generation system as recited in amended independent claim 6, wherein the direct current supplied by a power generating unit is set so the power generating unit operates in the Maximum Power Point. The *Simons* publication also fails to suggest these elements.

Claims 5 and 7 depend directly from independent claim 1 and 6, respectively, and so includes all the elements and limitations of their respective independent claims. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that dependent claims 5 and 7 are allowable over the *Darzy* patent and the *Simons* publication for at least the same reasons as set forth above for their respective independent claims.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the *Darzy* patent in view of the *Simons* publication is respectfully requested.

E. Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the *Darzy* patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,861,738 to Beckef-Irvin (the *Beckef-Irvin* patent).

The Applicants respectfully assert that the *Darzy* patent and the *Beckef-Irvin* patent, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of the Applicants' invention as claimed, as required to maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). As discussed

in Section A above, the Applicants assert that the *Darzy* patent fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a decentralized power generation system wherein the direct current supplied by a power generating unit is set so the power generating unit operates in the Maximum Power Point, as recited in amended independent claim 6. The *Beckef-Irvin* patent also fails to suggest these elements.

Claims 8 and 9 depends directly from independent claim 1 and so includes all the elements and limitations of independent claim 6. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that dependent claims 8 and 9 is allowable over the *Darzy* patent and the *Beckef-Irvin* patent for at least the same reasons as set forth above for independent claim 6.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the *Darzy* patent in view of the *Beckef-Irvin* patent is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-10 is requested. The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-10 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102, 103, and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested.


Dated: **March 17, 2008**

Respectfully submitted,
WENDT, MATTHIAS, *et al.*

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
& STANDARDS
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510

Robert J. Kraus
Registration No. 26,358
Attorney for Applicant

CARDINAL LAW GROUP
Suite 2000
1603 Orrington Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60201
Phone: (847) 905-7111
Fax: (847) 905-7113



Frank C. Nicholas
Registration No. 33,983
Attorney for Applicant